

## REMARKS

### Amendments to the Claims

Claims 10, 12, 14-17, and 23 were previously pending. As per the current amendment, claim 10 has been amended and claim 23 has been canceled. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request review of claims 10, 12, and 14-17, and submit that the presently pending claims are in condition for allowance.

### Claim Objections

Claim 10 is objected to because of the typographical error of the term “proceeded” being used instead of “preceded.” Applicants thank Examiner for identifying Applicants’ mistake. Applicants have corrected the mistake in currently amended claim 10. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request removal of the objections to claim 10.

### 35 USC 103(a)

Claims 10, 12, 14-17, and 23 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boguraev et al., US Patent No. 6,185,592 (hereinafter “Boguraev”), in view of Chase, US Patent No. 6,332,143 (hereinafter “Chase”), and further in view of Paik et al., US Patent No. 6,076,088 (hereinafter “Paik”).

Claim 23 has been canceled. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the removal of rejections to claim 23.

In reference to independent claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that Boguraev in view of Chase and Paik does not describe all of the features of the claim. More specifically, Boguraev in view of Chase and Paik does not at least describe “determining a definite article [being] located at the beginning of a sentence” (Emphasis Added).

The Office Action points to Figure 4B and Column 18 of Paik as describing a definite article being located at the beginning of the sentence (see page 20 of the present

Office Action). Applicants respectfully submit, though, that Paik does not describe determining the location of the definite article within the sentence. Paik is limited to describing that a determiner links to a noun. See Paik, column 19, lines 5-25 (“DTn”); See also column 18, line 21 (“Ds”). It is merely coincidence that a definite article is located in the beginning of the sentence illustrated in Figure 4b of Paik. The location of the definite article within the sentence has no bearing on the analysis performed by the invention described in Paik. Thus, Paik describes only the relation of terms to each other, not the location of terms within a sentence. Hence, Paik does not describe “determining a definite article [being] located at the beginning of a sentence” [Emphasis Added].

As a result, since Boguraev in view of Chase and Paik does not describe all of the features of claim 10, Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 10 is in condition for allowance. Regarding claims 12 and 14-17, since claims 12 and 14-17 depend from independent claim 10 and independent claim 10 is in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 12 and 14-17 are also in condition for allowance.

**Conclusion**

For at least the above reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. If Examiner wishes to discuss any portion of the docket or prosecution, Examiner is invited to telephone Brian Lambert at 408-927-3364.

Respectfully Submitted,



Brian Lambert  
Date: March 1, 2011  
Reg. No. 60,708  
IBM Almaden Research Center  
650 Harry Road  
C45A/12B  
San Jose, CA 95120  
Phone Number: 408-927-3364  
Facsimile Number: 408-927-3375